



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,331	08/19/2003	Scott S. McDaniel	13940US02	3987
23446	7590	04/19/2010	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				BELANI, KISHIN G
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			04/19/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,331	MCDANIEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KISHIN G. BELANI	2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 02/12/2010. **No claim has been amended. Claims 1-25 are now pending** in the present application. The examiner's prior rejections (from office action of 11/13/2009) for claims 1-25 still stand and are shown below. **This Action is made FINAL.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 10, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804).

Consider **claim 1**, Osborne shows and discloses a system for transferring data over a remote direct memory access (RDMA) network (Figs. 1 and 2 that show a system with an application 58, at the sender 50 and receiver 52 communicate by sending messages to each other across the network 82; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the system, including reciting that the operating system may set up a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to extract and copy the

message sent from sender's application 1 to message buffer 74 of the receiver's application 1); comprising:

a host comprising a driver and a network interface card (NIC), the driver being coupled to the NIC (Fig. 1 that shows a host (sender 50) with operating system 56, processor (driver) 54, and a network interface 84 that is coupled to the processor; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the system);

wherein a one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver and the NIC of the host (Figs. 1-2 that show the system and list the steps necessary (in Fig. 2) to initiate, by the processor 54 and NIC 84 of host 50, the transfer of a message data from application 1 to the corresponding application 1 at the receiving host 52; column 7, lines 18-36 describe the steps shown in Fig. 2, starting at step 99, by invoking a "Send" command 67 (details shown in Fig. 1) by application 1, which is copied over from the application memory to processor message buffer 62 in step 100, and processing, by processor 54, the message content to a format compatible with the protocol being used in step 102, before handing over the initiation process to NIC 84, that sends the message and its content over the network 82 in step 104, for delivery to a remote receiving host 52; column 7, lines 37-45 further disclose using a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to extract and copy the message to message buffer 74 of the remote host 52);

the one-shot initiation process comprising communicating a single command message comprising:

buffer command information (Fig. 1, “Send” command 67 with parameters ID (identifying the receiver of the message), Source Address (location where the message content is stored), and Size (amount of data to be sent) stored in the buffer 66; column 7, lines 19-25 disclose the same details), and

a write command to write a send command (Fig. 2, step 100 that shows a copy (write) command to copy message data from application memory to processor’s message buffer 62 (see Fig. 1)).

Consider **claim 2**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Osborne further shows and discloses the claimed system wherein the driver posts the single command message to perform the one-shot initiation process (Fig. 1, processor (driver) 54 that posts the Send(ID, Source Address, Size) command 67 to Network Interface 84, by copying the command from application 1 memory 66 to message buffers 62-64 of the processor’s operating system 56; Fig. 2, steps 100-104 that show the details of posting the send message to the NIC 84; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the same details).

Consider **claim 3**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Osborne further shows and discloses the claimed system wherein the buffer command information comprises a command to describe pinned-down memory buffers of the host (Fig. 1, pinned-down message buffers 62-64 of sender (host) 50 that store the Send command with its parameters (such as Source Address that points to the message’s content) and the message content copied from the Application 1 memory 66; column 7, lines 25-31 teach

the same details, further disclosing that the copying step is often optimized by mapping locations in the application memory 66 to locations in the message buffer 62 to avoid actual copying).

Consider **claim 4**, and **as it applies to claim 3 above**, Osborne further discloses the claimed system wherein the buffer command information comprises a command to bind a portion of the pinned down memory buffers of the host to a steering tag (STag) (column 7, lines 25-31 which further disclose that the copying step is often optimized by mapping locations (using pointers, considered by the examiner to correspond to applicants' steering tag STag, to de-reference the memory location) where the message content (i.e. payload) is actually stored in the application memory 66 to locations in the message buffer 62, so as to avoid actual copying of the content in the message buffers 62-64).

Consider **claim 5**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Osborne further discloses the claimed system wherein the send command is an RMDA send message (Fig. 1, "Send" command 67 with parameters ID (identifying the receiver of the message), Source Address (location where the message content is stored), and Size (amount of data to be sent) stored in the buffer 66; column 7, lines 19-25 disclose the same details; and column 7, lines 37-45 which disclose using a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to send the message to message buffer 74 of the remote host 52).

Consider **claim 10**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Osborne shows and discloses the claimed system, wherein the buffer command information provides a description of a section of memory (Fig. 1, Send command 67 with the parameter “Source Address” that points to a memory location in the application memory 66, where the content of the message being sent by RDMA is stored, thereby providing a description of a section of memory; the corresponding content when copied into the message buffers 62-64 of the operating system 56, also show that the buffer command information provides a description of a section of memory; column 7, lines 14-45 describe the same details).

Consider **claim 16**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Osborne shows and discloses the claimed system wherein the NIC comprises an RDMA-enabled NIC (Fig. 1 that shows Network Interface (NIC) 84; column 7, lines 37-45 describe the NIC as a Remote DMA-enabled NIC).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-9, 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Roach et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,304,910 B1)**.

Consider **claim 6**, and **as it applies to claim 4 above**, Osborne discloses the claimed system, except wherein the NIC places the STag value in an optional field in a direct data placement DDP or RDMA header.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose the claimed system wherein the NIC places the STag value in an optional field in a direct data placement DDP or RDMA header (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list entries corresponding to the STag values and BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the STag value in an optional field in a direct data placement DDP or RDMA header, as taught by Roach et al., in the system of Osborne, so as to be able to handle non-contiguous data blocks during the transfer.

Consider **claim 7**, and **as it applies to claim 6 above**, Osborne discloses the claimed system, except wherein the NIC encodes a value into a field in the DDP or RDMA header indicating that the STag value in the optional field is valid.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose a system wherein the NIC encodes a value into a field in the DDP or RDMA header indicating that the STag value in the optional field is valid (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines

1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list entries corresponding to the STag values and BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encode a value into a field in the DDP or RDMA header indicating that the STag value in the optional field is valid, as taught by Roach et al., in the system of Osborne, so as to be able to distinguish valid data block entries for remote transfer.

Consider **claim 8**, and **as it applies to claim 6 above**, Osborne discloses the claimed system, except wherein the NIC sets one or more bits in a field in the DDP or RDMA header indicating that the STag value in the optional field is valid.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose a system wherein the NIC sets one or more bits in a field in the DDP or RDMA header indicating that the STag value in the optional field is valid (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list entries corresponding to the STag values and BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set a value into a field in the DDP or RDMA header indicating that the STag value in the optional field is valid, as taught by Roach et al., in

the system of Osborne, so as to be able to distinguish valid data block entries for remote transfer.

Consider **claim 9**, and **as it applies to claim 6 above**, Osborne discloses the claimed system, except wherein the NIC sets one or more bits or encodes a value into a second field in the DDP or RDMA header to advertise the portion of the pinned memory buffers of the host associated with the STag.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose a system wherein the NIC sets one or more bits or encodes a value into a second field in the DDP or RDMA header to advertise the portion of the pinned memory buffers of the host associated with the STag (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list entries corresponding to the STag values and BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries, thereby advertising the portion of the pinned memory buffers of the host associated with the STag).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set one or more bits or encode a value into a second field in the DDP or RDMA header to advertise the portion of the pinned memory buffers of the host associated with the STag, as taught by Roach et al., in the system of Osborne, so as to be able to distinguish valid data block entries for remote transfer.

Consider **claim 11**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Osborne discloses the claimed system, except wherein the single command message is posted to a command ring of the host.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al., disclose a system wherein the single command message is posted to a command ring of the host (Fig. 5A, block 32; column 6, lines 48-64 that disclose a command ring structure as a circular queue of command entries).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to post the single command message to a command ring of the host, as taught by Roach et al., in the system of Osborne, so as to be able to execute the commands in the FIFO order with opportunity for the non-serviced commands to get multiple turns at the service.

Consider **claim 24**, Osborne shows and discloses a method for transferring data over an RDMA network (Figs. 1 and 2 that show a method used with an application 58, at the sender 50 and receiver 52 wherein the sender and receiver communicate by sending messages to each other across the network 82; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the method, including reciting that the operating system may set up a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to extract and copy the message sent from sender's application 1 to message buffer 74 of the receiver's application 1), comprising:

initiating an RDMA write operation using a one-shot initiation process between a driver and a NIC of a host (Fig. 1 that shows a host (sender 50) with operating system 56, processor (driver) 54, and a network interface 84 that is coupled to the processor; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the method; Figs. 1-2 that further show the method and list the steps necessary (in Fig. 2) to initiate, by the processor 54 and NIC 84 of host 50, the transfer of a message data from application 1 to the corresponding application 1 at the receiving host 52; column 7, lines 18-36 describe the steps shown in Fig. 2, starting at step 99, by invoking a “Send” command 67 (details shown in Fig. 1) by application 1, which is copied over from the application memory to processor message buffer 62 in step 100, and processing, by processor 54, the message content to a format compatible with the protocol being used in step 102, before handing over the initiation process to NIC 84, that sends the message and its content over the network 82 in step 104, for delivery to a remote receiving host 52; column 7, lines 37-45 further disclose using a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to extract and copy the message to message buffer 74 of the remote host 52); wherein the one-shot initiation process comprises communicating a single command message comprising buffer command information comprising commands to insert an STag value, and a write command to write an RDMA send message (Fig. 1 that shows a one-shot initiation process that comprises communicating a single Send command 67 message with parameters ID (of destination host), source address pointer (STag value that is part of the buffer command information), and message size (also a part of the buffer command information) from a sending host 50 to a receiving host 52 via a

processor 54, NIC 84, network 82 to NIC 86, processor 70, and finally to receiving host 52), Fig. 1 further showing a copying process to copy the send command and the associated parameters of the send command from the Application 1 buffers 66 to the operating system's message buffers 62-64, thereby disclosing a write command to write an RDMA send message).

However, Osborne does not show or disclose validating STag value; inserting an STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header of the RDMA send message; and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the DDP or RDMA header.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose inserting an STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header of an RDMA send message (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list entries corresponding to the STag values); and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the DDP or RDMA header (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header of an RDMA send message, and validate the STag value in the first field

with a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the DDP or RDMA header, as taught by Roach et al., in the method of Osborne, so as to be able to handle non-contiguous data blocks during the transfer and distinguish valid data block entries for remote transfer.

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Roach et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,304,910 B1)** and further in view of **Tillier (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,421,742 B1)**.

Consider **claim 12**, and **as it applies to claim 11 above**, Osborne as modified by Roach et al., discloses the claimed system, except wherein the driver allocates an STag value.

In the same field of endeavor, Tillier shows and discloses the claimed system wherein the driver allocates an STag value (Fig. 8, arrow marked ‘Pointer to “A”’ which the examiner has interpreted to be equivalent to a STag value, being allocated by the Input/output unit (driver) and received by NIC (functionally represented by the middle column), the pointer value representing the address of the pinned down memory).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a system wherein the driver allocates an STag value, as taught by Tillier, in the system of Osborne, as modified by Roach et al., so as to associate and locate the pinned-down memory buffers using the STag value.

Consider **claim 13**, and **as it applies to claim 12 above**, Osborne as modified by Roach et al., and Tillier, further discloses the claimed system, wherein the STag value is returned synchronously from a command call (in Roach et al. reference, column 6, lines 56-64 which disclose that the host driver increments the “put” pointer whenever a command is queued to the command ring, making the updated pointer (STag value) synchronously available from a call command).

Consider **claim 14**, and **as it applies to claim 12 above**, Osborne, as modified by Roach et al., and Tillier, further discloses the claimed system, wherein the STag value is saved in a driver command table of the host (in Roach et al. reference, Fig. 3, host memory block 42 and transfer ready queue 60; column 5, lines 44-52 that disclose a lookup field (STag value) inside each frame header includes a pointer to an associated context, and the host driver saves these fields in the host memory 42).

Consider **claim 15**, and **as it applies to claim 14 above**, Osborne, as modified by Roach et al., and Tillier, further discloses the claimed system, wherein the STag value saved in a driver command table is associated with an application reference number (in Roach et al. reference, Figs. 5A and 5B; column 5, lines 47-52 which disclose that the context field associated with a pointer field (STag value) saved in a driver command table is associated with a small computer systems interface (SCSI)

state information interpreted by the examiner to be associated with the application reference number).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Pandya (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,376,755 B2)**.

Consider **claim 17**, Osborne shows and discloses a system for transferring data over a remote direct memory access (RDMA) network (Figs. 1 and 2 that show a system with an application 78, at the receiver host 52, that communicates with the corresponding application 1 at the sender host 50, by receiving/sending messages to each other across the network 82; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the system, including reciting that the operating system may set up a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to extract and copy the message sent from sender's application 1 to message buffer 74 of the receiver's application 1), comprising: a host comprising a driver and a network interface card (NIC), the driver being coupled to the NIC (Fig. 1 that shows a receiving host 52 with operating system 72, processor (driver) 70, and a network interface 86 that is coupled to the processor; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the system), wherein a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver and the NIC of the host (Figs. 1-2 that show the system and list the steps necessary (in Fig. 2) to complete, by the processor 70 and NIC 86 of the receiving host

52, the transfer of a message data from application 1 at the sender host 50 to the corresponding application 1 at the receiving host 52, and a “Receive” command 77 (details shown in Fig. 1); column 7, lines 37-65 describe the message receiving steps 106-110 shown in Fig. 2, further disclosing that the message arrival at the receiver causes an interrupt to the processor 70, and the operating system 72 extracts the message (step 106) from the network in cooperation with NIC 86, and stores it into message buffer 74 in the operating system using Direct Memory Access (DMA); the operating system 72 then performs protocol processing, if necessary, in step 108; then copies the message in step 110 from the message buffer 72 at the receiver 52 to application memory (endpoint 79), in response to a “Receive” command request 77 from application 78).

However, Osborne does not explicitly disclose that the one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information.

In the same field of endeavor, Pandya discloses the claimed system, including sending a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information (Fig. 33 that shows the details of a "Write" operation, including send status and sense step 3310 at the completion of the “Send Data” operation; column 13, lines 35-48 which describe that at the completion of data transfer (associated with the send data command), the status of the command execution is passed onto the host SCSI layer, which then does the appropriate processing, including releasing the buffers being used for data transfer to the application).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information, as taught by Pandya, in the system of Osborne, so as to enable the sending host to perform clean-up operations after the message with its content has been successfully received by the receiving host.

Claims 18, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Pandya (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,376,755 B2)** and further in view of **Tillier (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,421,742 B1)**.

Consider **claim 18**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Osborne, as modified by Pandya, shows and discloses the claimed system, except wherein the NIC receives a message comprising an optional field carrying a STag value, the STag value being associated with pinned memory in a remote host.

In the same field of endeavor, Tillier shows and discloses the claimed system, wherein the NIC receives a message comprising an optional field carrying an STag value, the STag value being associated with pinned memory in a remote host (Fig. 8, arrow marked ‘Pointer to “A”’ which the examiner has interpreted to be equivalent to a STag value, being received by NIC along with the “Store Data” command, the pointer value representing the address of the pinned down memory in a remote host).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a system wherein the NIC receives a message comprising an optional field carrying an STag value, the STag value being associated with pinned memory in a remote host, as taught by Tillier, in the system of Osborne, as modified by Pandya, so as to be able to access the message content in the pinned memory in the remote host.

Consider **claim 20**, and **as it applies to claim 18 above**, Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, further shows and discloses a system wherein the NIC de-associates the STag value with the pinned memory in the host, thereby preventing further access to the pinned memory using the de-associated STag value (in Tillier reference, Fig. 6, blocks 604-606 that depict freeing up of allocated resources, corresponding to de-associating the STag value from the pinned-memory in the host, thereby preventing further access to the pinned memory using the de-associated STag value; column 8, lines 9-15 that disclose the same details).

Consider **claim 22**, and **as it applies to claim 18 above**, Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, further shows and discloses the claimed system wherein the NIC de-associates the STag value with previously associated SGL information (in Tillier reference, Fig. 6, blocks 604-606 that depict freeing up of allocated resources, corresponding to de-associating the STag value pointing to the SGL; cleanup routine of Fig. 7B; column 8, lines 9-15 that disclose the same details).

Consider **claim 23**, and **as it applies to claim 20 above**, Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, further shows and discloses a system wherein the NIC frees any resources dedicated to information regarding the pinned memory (in Tillier reference, Fig. 6, blocks 604-606 that depict freeing up of allocated resources; cleanup routine of Fig. 7B; column 8, lines 9-15 that disclose NIC freeing up the allocated resources).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Pandya (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,376,755 B2)** and further in view of **Tillier (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,421,742 B1)** and further in view of **Roach et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,304,910 B1)**.

Consider **claim 19**, and **as it applies to claim 18 above**, Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, discloses the claimed system, except wherein a header of the message indicates the validity of the optional field with a bit flag or specified value in an encoded field.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose a system wherein a header of the message indicates the validity of the optional field with a bit flag or specified value in an encoded field (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list

entries corresponding to the STag values and BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries, thereby indicating the validity of the optional field with a bit flag or specified value in an encoded field).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to indicate the validity of the optional field with a bit flag or specified value in an encoded field, as taught by Roach et al., in the system of Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, so as to be able to distinguish valid data block entries for remote transfer.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Pandya (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,376,755 B2)** and further in view of **Tillier (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,421,742 B1)** and further in view of **Futral et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,991,797)**.

Consider **claim 21**, and **as it applies to claim 18 above**, Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, further discloses the claimed system, wherein the single completion message comprises the optional field carrying the STag value received by the NIC; and wherein the NIC delivers the single completion message to the driver (in Pandya reference, Fig. 35, Target Operations 3507-3509 that send “Status and Sense” message via NIC and Driver to the Initiator of “Write” command at the completion of the command; since the STag field is optional, it is not shown; the NIC then delivers the

message to the LAN driver 716 shown in Fig. 7; column 34, lines 29-30 disclose the response to data transfer completion operation).

However, Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, do not specifically show or disclose the claimed system wherein the driver compares the STag value received with a STag value previously sent.

In the same field of endeavor, Futral et al. show and disclose a system wherein the NIC delivers the message to the driver, and wherein the driver compares the STag value received with a STag value previously sent (Fig. 4, SGL word 2 (chain pointer) that provides address to additional transaction detail element list, when the buffers are scattered across multiple locations, therefore requiring an appended list. In such cases, the driver compares the SGL address received with a prior value to ensure that the same list is being processed with additional buffer addresses in the appended chain list; column 6, lines 36-46 discloses the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide capability in the driver to compare the STag value received with a STag value previously sent, as taught by Futral et al., in the system of Osborne, as modified by Pandya and Tillier, so as to be able to handle multiple non-contiguous data blocks during the transfer.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osborne (U.S. Patent Publication # 5,790,804)** in view of **Pandya (U.S. Patent**

Publication # 7,376,755 B2) and further in view of **Roach et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,304,910 B1).**

Consider **claim 25**, Osborne shows and discloses a method for transferring data over an RDMA network (Figs. 1 and 2 that show a method used with an application 58, at the sender 50 and receiver 52 wherein the sender and receiver communicate by sending messages to each other across the network 82; column 7, lines 14-45 disclose the details of the method, including reciting that the operating system may set up a direct memory access (DMA) with the network interface to extract and copy the message sent from sender's application 1 to message buffer 74 of the receiver's application 1), comprising:

completing an RDMA write operation using a one-shot completion process between a NIC and a driver of a host (Figs. 1-2 that show the system and list the steps necessary (in Fig. 2) to complete, by the processor 70 and NIC 86 of the receiving host 52, the transfer of a message data from application 1 at the sender host 50 to the corresponding application 1 at the receiving host 52, and a "Receive" command 77 (details shown in Fig. 1); column 7, lines 37-65 describe the message receiving steps 106-110 shown in Fig. 2, further disclosing that the message arrival at the receiver causes an interrupt to the processor 70, and the operating system 72 extracts the message (step 106) from the network in cooperation with NIC 86, and stores it into message buffer 74 in the operating system using Direct Memory Access (DMA); the operating system 72 then performs protocol processing, if necessary, in step 108; then

copies the message in step 110 from the message buffer 72 at the receiver 52 to application memory (endpoint 79), in response to a "Receive" command request 77 from application 78).

However, Osborne does not specifically show and disclose that the one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single completion message comprising:

a send complete indication, buffer freeing status information, and an STag value; receiving the single completion message; identifying the STag value in a first field of a header of the single completion message; and validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header.

In the same field of endeavor, Pandya shows and discloses the claimed method, wherein the one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single completion message comprising:

a send complete indication, buffer freeing status information, and an STag value (Fig. 33 that shows the details of a "Write" operation, including send status and sense step 3310 at the completion of the "Send Data" operation; column 13, lines 35-48 which describe that at the completion of data transfer (associated with the send data command), the status of the command execution is passed onto the host SCSI layer, which then does the appropriate processing, including releasing the buffers being used for data transfer to the application; since releasing the buffers implies knowing where in

the memory the buffers are, it is implied that a pointer (STag) to the message buffers is also sent with the send complete indication message); and receiving the single completion message (Fig. 33, message “send status and sense” 3310 from the target to the initiator in response to the “Write” command request 3301, wherein the message indicates command complete message 3312 at the initiator; column 13, lines 35-48 which describe the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide in the one-shot completion process that comprises communicating a single completion message, a send complete indication, buffer freeing status information, and an STag value, as taught by Pandya, in the method of Osborne, so as to free up the locked (pinned-down) buffers after the data transfer between the two hosts is complete.

However, Osborne, as modified by Pandya, does not disclose identifying a STag value in a first field of a header of the completion message; and validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header.

In the same field of endeavor, Roach et al. show and disclose identifying a STag value in a first field of a header of the completion message (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BSWA buffer pointer list entries corresponding to the STag values); and

validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header (Fig. 8 that shows the bit-level definition of each of the two 32-bit word entry shown in Fig. 9; column 8, lines 32-67 and column 9, lines 1-18 that disclose the details of the bit-level structure including BLM flag fields indicating validity of the BSWA entries).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify a STag value in a first field of a header of the completion message, and validate the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header, as taught by Roach et al., in the method of Osborne, as modified by Pandya, so as to be able to handle non-contiguous data blocks during the transfer and distinguish valid data block entries for remote transfer.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed 02/12/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. After carefully reviewing the arguments presented and the cited prior art used for rejecting the presented claims, the examiner has concluded that the cited references do adequately teach each and every claim element, when broadly interpreted by the examiner. The claims are therefore anticipated by or obvious over the cited prior art, non-novel, and not allowable in their present form. The examiner's response to the presented arguments is as follows:

Consider **claim 1**. On page 9 of the “Remarks” section, the applicants allege that the cited reference of Osborne shows (in Figs. 1-2) and teaches (in column 7, lines 14-45) only a conventional communication process **from an application 58 to operating system 56**, and not a one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation **between a driver and a NIC of a host**. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants’ allegation. Osborne’s Figs 1-2 very clearly show communication between a sender 50 and a receiver 52 which is remote from the sender and communicatively linked to it by network 82. Therefore any DMA (Direct Memory Access) action (see column 7, lines 42-45) between the two hosts 50 and 52 can be characterized as an RDMA action. The applicants should also note that the ID parameter of the “Send” command shown in Fig. 1 represents the ID of the receiving host 52 (see column 7, lines 20-25) and not a conventional communication between application 58 and operating system 56, as alleged. Thus, Osborne does teach the claim 1 element of “wherein a one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver (processor 54) and a NIC (Net Interface 84) of the host, the one-shot initiation process comprising communicating a single command message comprising: buffer command information (e.g. send command 67 Send (ID, source address, size) shown in Fig. 1), and a write command to write a send command”.

In paragraph 3, on page 9 of the “Remarks”, the applicants further allege that “RDMA operations do not involve copying message data from application memory 66 to the operating system buffers 62”, as taught by Osborne. Since the applicants have mischaracterized the copying operation as an RDMA operation as explained above, the

argument is without merit. The real RDMA operation is between the two hosts 50 and 52, separated by the network 82, and not between the application 58 and operating system 56. The applicants also allege, without any supporting reason, that Osborne's disclosure regarding setting up **DMA at a receiver** is different than an **initiation process of an RDMA operation**. The examiner still maintains that the operations are equivalent, considering the fact that the applicants have not provided their definition of the term "one-shot". Therefore, independent claim 1 and corresponding dependent claims 2-16 are considered not allowable.

Next, consider **claim 24**. On page 12 of the "Remarks", the applicants correctly argue that the cited parameters of "Receiver's ID", "source address", and "message size" are not commands to insert a STag value, and a write command to write an RDMA send message. These are the parameters of the send command, inserted while building the send command structure, by a process that builds the send command by issuing appropriate commands, and then writing the command structure to the message buffers 62 shown in Fig. 1. These are common processing details, normally understood by one familiar with the art.

On page 12 of the "Remarks" section, the applicants argue that the cited prior art of Roach et al. merely describes a "Buffer Pointer List Format" (in Fig. 9) and a "Buffer Pointer List Entry Format" (in Fig. 8), which is not the same as the claim element "validating STag value". The examiner would like to state that the format of the buffer pointer list entry, as shown in Fig. 8, corresponds to the STag value in the instant application. The validation details of different bits (31-24) of the buffer pointer list entry

are disclosed in column 8, line 39 through column 9 and line 17. Therefore, Roach et al. do disclose validating a STag value by setting specific bits of the STag field, which is then used by Osborne in the RDMA send message.

The applicants also assert that the cited prior art of Roach et al. is wholly unrelated to inserting an STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in the second field of the DDP or RDMA header, instead it is related to buffer lists stored in physical memory. The examiner disagrees with this assertion. The field of invention paragraph (column 1, lines 5-10) discloses that the invention relates to devices transferring data in computer networks, and more particularly to a device utilizing control bits to facilitate generating and transmitting frames of data across a computer network boundary.

Next consider independent **claim 17**. On page 14 of the “Remarks” section, the applicants argue that the examiner’s reference to the “Receive” command in Fig. 1 of the cited reference of Osborne does not correspond to the claim element “wherein a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver and the NIC of the host, the one shot completion process comprising communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information”. The applicants then continue to argue that a receive command sent between an application 78 and an operating system 72 in a receiver is clearly different than a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation being performed between the driver and the NIC of the host. The examiner, for the

completeness sake, was merely trying to explain the second half of the send-receive process in the Osborne reference before describing the send completion status in the Pandya reference. As indicated in the office action of 11/13/2009, the examiner stated that Osborne does not explicitly disclose that the one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information. This claim element is fully disclosed in the Pandya reference (see Fig. 33, step 3310; column 13, lines 35-48).

On page 15 of the “Remarks” section, the applicants continue arguing that the cited Pandya reference is completely unrelated to an RDMA operation. The examiner would like to point out the title “TCP/IP Processor and Engine using RDMA” and various figures including previously cited Fig. 35 in Pandya reference that clearly show that Pandya discloses RDMA operations. The applicants themselves acknowledge that Figs. 35-38 (cited in the previous office action) do teach RDMA operations. The applicants then allege that Pandya’s reference of “Send Status & Sense” 3310 (cited by the examiner) merely illustrates a message sent from a target to an initiator and is not a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation being performed between the driver and the NIC of the host. The examiner would like to explain that claim 17 was rejected on the basis of 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, wherein Osborne reference taught one-shot RDMA operation, except explicitly sending a completion message to the sending host, for which the examiner included the teachings of Pandya reference. Moreover, the examiner had clearly pointed out (in the previous office action) that Pandya does indeed teach the details of one-shot RDMA operation disclosed in claim

17. As to applicants' argument that Pandya's specification fails to even mention steps 3310-3312, the examiner would like to point out the response from the prior office action shown below:

"A small detail like a completion status may merely be shown, without elaboration. However, Pandya (in column 34, lines 29-30) does disclose that the operation completion is indicated using the command completion response. As to Pandya reference not detailing freeing buffers at the end of completing the command, it is a good programming practice to always free up previously reserved buffers at the end of successful completion of a process, so that other applications have access to those buffers. The freeing up of buffers is therefore inherently implied in Pandya, and therefore, not specifically mentioned".

Next consider **independent claim 25**. On page 18 of the "Remarks" section, the applicants repeat the same arguments for independent claim 25 that they alleged for claim 1. The examiner has already responded to such arguments, so they will not be repeated, except the argument that "RDMA completion process (i.e. complete indication and buffer freeing status information) occurs in the transmitting node and not in the receiving node; and the argument that RDMA operations do not involve copying message data from application memory 66 to operating system buffers 62 as taught by Osborne. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' arguments. The indication of completion must come from the receiving node, not the transmitting node. Only after such indicating message is received from the receiving node, do both the receiving and the transmitting nodes free up their respective buffers. Also, the

applicants' argument that copying message data from application memory 66 to operating system buffers 62, as taught by Osborne, is not an RDMA operation is also without any merit, because that operation is a precursor to the real RDMA operation that takes place later.

The examiner has now responded to every argument presented by the applicants, and still maintains the position that the cited prior art teach each and every claim element presented. The claims are therefore obvious over the prior art, and not allowable in their present form.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2443

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kishin G. Belani whose telephone number is (571) 270-1768. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-0800.

*/K. G. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2443*

April 13, 2010

*/George C Neurauter, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443*